

1 JJENNIFER LEE TAYLOR (SBN 161368)  
2 JTaylor@mofo.com  
3 ROBIN L. BREWER (SBN 253686)  
4 RBrewer@mofo.com  
5 JOYCE LIOU (SBN 277720)  
6 JLiou@mofo.com  
7 MICHAEL J. GUO (SBN 284917)  
8 MGuo@mofo.com  
9 AMANDA D. PHILLIPS (SBN 305614)  
10 APhillips@mofo.com  
11 MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
12 425 Market Street  
13 San Francisco, California 94105-2482  
14 Telephone: (415) 268-7000  
15 Facsimile: (415) 268-7522

9 *Attorneys for Defendants*  
10 UBIQUITI NETWORKS, INC. and  
UBIQUITI NETWORKS INTERNATIONAL  
LIMITED

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

14 | SYNOPSYS, INC.

Case No. 5:17-cv-00561-WHO

Plaintiff.

16 | v.

**DECLARATION OF HARTLEY  
NISENBAUM IN SUPPORT OF  
DEFENDANTS UBIQUITI  
NETWORKS, INC. AND  
UBIQUITI NETWORKS  
INTERNATIONAL LIMITED'S  
OPPOSITION TO SYNOPSYS,  
INC.'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO  
FILE THIRD AMENDED  
COMPLAINT**

17 UBIQUITI NETWORKS, INC., UBIQUITI  
18 NETWORKS INTERNATIONAL LIMITED,  
19 CHING-HAN TSAI, and DOES 1-20,  
inclusive,

## Defendants.

21 UBIQUITI NETWORKS, INC. and UBIQUITI  
22 NETWORKS INTERNATIONAL LIMITED.

### Counterclaimants.

24

25 | SYNOPSYS, INC.

### Counterdefendant.

Date: June 6, 2018

Time: 2:00 p.m.

Place: Courtroom 2, 17th Floor

Judge: Honorable William H. Orrick

1 I, Hartley Nisenbaum, declare as follows:

2       1. I am employed by Ubiquiti Networks, Inc., (“Ubiquiti”) as Executive Vice  
 3 President of Legal Affairs. I submit this declaration in support of Defendants Ubiquiti Networks,  
 4 Inc. and Ubiquiti Networks International Limited’s (“UNIL”) Opposition to Synopsys, Inc.’s  
 5 Motion for Leave to File Third Amended Complaint. I have personal knowledge of the facts  
 6 contained in this declaration. If called as a witness, I could and would testify competently as  
 7 follows.

8       2. Ubiquiti and UNIL were sued by Plaintiff Synopsys, Inc. (“Synopsys”) on Friday,  
 9 February 3, 2017. The next business day, Monday, February 6, 2017, I sent out a litigation hold  
 10 on behalf of Ubiquiti and UNIL. The litigation hold recipients included Defendant Ching-Han  
 11 Tsai, Sheng-Feng Wang, Chi-Hsueh Huang, Hung-Lun Lian, Ya-Chau Yang, Yi-Te Lee, Chang-  
 12 Ching Yang, and Hua-Lin Hsu, among others. Subsequent to the distribution of the litigation  
 13 hold notice, Defendant Tsai was contacted and asked to make sure his team understood how  
 14 important a litigation hold notice is. Defendant Tsai confirmed that he stressed the importance of  
 15 the litigation hold to his team.

16       3. When I sent the litigation hold, I expected it would be observed by those receiving  
 17 it, and I had no reason to believe anyone would fail to comply with the litigation hold and destroy  
 18 evidence. To the contrary, I had every indication that they understood their obligation to retain  
 19 documents.

20       4. As part of discovery in the case, Defendant Tsai’s two computers and an external  
 21 drive were imaged in Fall 2017. During a forensic inspection of those devices in December 2017,  
 22 Ubiquiti discovered that Defendant Tsai had used a program called CCleaner to wipe portions of  
 23 the external drive, leaving only a single virtual machine.

24       5. In mid-January 2018, Ubiquiti discovered on one of Defendant Tsai’s computers  
 25 two personal Skype conversations that Defendant Tsai started in 2013 with computer engineers  
 26 that he recruited to work on the ASIC design project at UNIL. The Skype conversations  
 27 continued into 2014, well after those computer engineers started to work for UNIL. Among other  
 28 things, the Skype conversations contained references to wiping computers, erasing Skype

1 conversations, and using hacked software. True and correct copies of the Skype conversations  
 2 are attached as Exhibits 1 and 2.

3       6. After discovering the wiped drive and the Skype conversations, Ubiquiti realized  
 4 that Defendant Tsai had not been honest during its investigations in 2016 and 2017. Ubiquiti also  
 5 learned that Defendant Tsai had lied to Ubiquiti management regarding the use of Synopsys  
 6 software in Taiwan (including his own use of the software). Ubiquiti also realized that Defendant  
 7 Tsai had not complied with the company's express instructions in its litigation hold and likely had  
 8 instructed an unknown number of ASIC team members to destroy documents. Ubiquiti decided  
 9 that more had to be done to address the situation.

10       7. In early February 2018, Ubiquiti reminded the Taiwanese engineers of their duty  
 11 to preserve evidence and to comply with company policies against violating intellectual property  
 12 rights, and I circulated another copy of the litigation hold notice to the ASIC team members in  
 13 Taiwan. All of the Taiwanese team members also certified that they would abide by all company  
 14 policies going forward and they were told that they would be terminated if they violated any  
 15 company policy going forward.

16       8. Out of an abundance of caution, after Judge Beeler ordered forensic inspections of  
 17 computers of certain Taiwanese team members and after the parties subsequently stipulated to a  
 18 forensic inspection protocol, on February 26, 2018, Ubiquiti decided to image the devices in  
 19 Taiwan without providing any advance notice to any of the Taiwanese ASIC team members to  
 20 prevent any additional use of CCleaner or any similar "wiping" program by Defendant Tsai's  
 21 team members in Taiwan.

22       9. Ubiquiti contracted with Epiq Systems, Inc., a forensic vendor, who sent a forensic  
 23 specialist from Hong Kong to our Taipei office. Because he could not image all of the devices  
 24 simultaneously, the devices of the engineers most likely to have relevant information as  
 25 previously identified by Synopsys, including those of Ya-Chau Yang, were imaged the first day.  
 26 The remaining devices were imaged over the course of the week. The engineers were not  
 27 informed prior to Epiq's arrival in our office that their devices would be collected and imaged,  
 28

1 and they were not told the order in which devices would be collected and imaged during the  
 2 week.

3       10. Despite these efforts, Ubiquiti learned from reviewing Synopsys' motion for leave  
 4 to amend of Synopsys' allegations that materials were "suspiciously" deleted from certain UNIL  
 5 engineers' devices in February and March, including during the week that Epiq was in our Taipei  
 6 office collecting and imaging devices.

7       11. The day after Synopsys filed its motion, Ubiquiti suspended Defendant Ching-Han  
 8 Tsai, Chi-Hsueh Huang, Hung-Lun Lian, Ya-Chau Yang, Yi-Te Lee, Chang-Ching Yang, and  
 9 Hua-Lin Hsu, all of whom are implicated by Synopsys' allegations of spoliation, pending a  
 10 determination of whether the allegations in the proposed Third Amended Complaint are true.  
 11 That same day, Ubiquiti also asked Epiq to investigate Synopsys' spoliation allegations in the  
 12 proposed amended complaint. As soon as Epiq's investigation is completed, Ubiquiti will  
 13 determine the appropriate course of action with respect to the suspended employees, which likely  
 14 will be termination if Synopsys' allegations about them are substantiated.

15       12. To make sure it understands the full scope of the ASIC team's conduct, Ubiquiti  
 16 also engaged the leading forensic firm, Stroz Friedberg, to conduct an independent forensic  
 17 investigation of the devices of all ASIC team members, as well as the servers and storage array  
 18 located in Taiwan. This investigation may lead to additional disciplinary action against the  
 19 suspended ASIC team members.

20       I declare under penalty of perjury of the laws of the United States that the foregoing is true  
 21 and correct.

22       Executed this 16th day of May, 2018, in New York, New York.

23

24

25

26

27

28

By: /s/ Hartley Nisenbaum  
**HARTLEY NISENBAUM**